

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/650,057 | VON KNEBEL DOEBERITZ ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Stephen L. Rawlings, Ph.D. | 1643 |

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Stephen L. Rawlings, Ph.D.

(3) _____

(2) Viola T. Kung, Ph.D.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 07 September 2007

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Rejections of claims under §§ 102 and 103; obviousness-type double patenting; rejections under § 112, second paragraph

Claims discussed:

1-6, 20, 21 and 23-28

Prior art documents discussed:

U.S. Patent No. 6,709,832; Gerardts et al.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Dr. Kung telephoned the Examiner to request an interview before issuance of the next Office action; the Examiner returned Dr. Kung's call, discussing the reasons that the amendment filed June 26, 2007, was not believed to have placed this application in condition for allowance. Dr. Kung proposed amending the claims to further limit the lysis buffer used in the process to a lysis buffer comprising a concentration of SDS in the range of 0.1-1%. Dr Kung explained that it is Applicant's position that one would not have ordinarily expected such a buffer to be suitable or compatible for use in a liquid or heterogeneous phase immunoassay, such as an ELISA. Agreeably, it is recognized that such concentrations of SDS are largely inhibitory of the binding interaction between an antibody and the antigen to which the antibody binds. So, after further consideration and search, it was agreed that such an amendment would render the claimed invention a non-obvious variant of the process disclosed by the prior art of record. Having found no other prior art teaching or fairly suggesting such a process that comprises reacting the antibody directly in the lysis buffer comprising such concentrations of SDS, the Examiner proposed further amemdmnts that would obviate remaining issues. Dr. Kung authorized entry of the proposed amendment.